

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated December 8, 2006 Applicants submit the following remarks. Claims 15 and 20 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) as allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of the previous claim. Claims 15 and 20 were rejected under 25 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1 – 42 are pending in the Application and these claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being allegedly anticipated by “Process Hijacking” Zandy et al. herein referred to as “ZDY”. Applicants herein amend claims 1-7, 9, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 28, 34, and 42, and cancel claims 15, 16, and 20, and present new claim 43. No new matter is added. As a result claims 1-14, 17, 19, and 21-43 are pending. Further examination and review in view of the amendments and remarks below is respectfully requested.

### ***Telephonic Interview***

On March 6, 2007, the undersigned conducted a telephonic interview with Examiner Philip Wang. During the interview, the prior art of record and possible amendments to the independent claims were discussed. The Examiner’s helpful remarks have lead the undersigned to amend the independent claims in the fashion show above in the listing of the claims.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 15 and 20 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) as allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of the previous claim. Claims 15 and 20 were rejected under 25 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Without conceding whether claims 15 and 20 further limit the subject matter of the claim from which they depend or whether claims 15 and 20 fail to comply with the

written description requirement Applicants have canceled claims 15 and 20. Accordingly, the objection of claims 15 and 20 is moot.

Claim 21 was objected to for containing two periods. Applicants have amended the claim to correct the typographical error pointed out by the examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the objection is overcome.

Claim 42 was objected to under 25 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended claim 42 to correct the typographical error pointed out by the examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the objection is overcome.

***35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claim 1 recites in part:

- initiating said shadow process in debug mode in said first execution environment;
- initializing said trusted agent process in said second execution environment;
- attaching said debugger to said shadow process;
- once said debugger is attached, configuring said shadow process to schedule execution of said process by said trusted agent.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 patentably defines over ZDY for at least the following reason. In the present Office Action, the Examiner asserted that p. 177 [sic], right col., line 1, discloses allowing said shadow process to schedule execution of said process by said trusted agent. (Office Action dated 12-8-06 at p. 4). According to ZDY, when a process is hijacked it uses a shadow process to “preserve [the] file state” (ZDY at p. 181, right col.) of the process that is being hijacked, it does not *schedule* execution of a process *by said trusted agent* running in a second execution environment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

Insomuch as claims 2- 14 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 they to patentably define over the art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections.

**DOCKET NO.:** 305786.01 / MSFT-2780  
**Application No.:** 10/759,818  
**Office Action Dated:** December 8, 2006

**PATENT**

Independent claim 21, 36, and newly presented claim 43 recite similar elements to that of claim 1 and patentably define over the cited art for at least the same reason described above with respect to claim 1. Inasmuch as claims 17 – 19, 21, 22 – 35, and 36 - 42 incorporate by reference all the limitations of claims from which they depend they also patentably define of the reference for at least the same reason.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants request the Examiner reconsider the rejection and issue a Notice of Allowance of all the claims.

Date: April 9, 2007

/David M. Platz/  
David M. Platz  
Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439